



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

index, which greatly facilitates the use of the book. It is high time that the Germans should devote some of their love of detail toward indexing.

If a second edition of the English translation is issued the book should undergo a thorough revision. This done, it will become a valuable contribution to Bismarck literature in the English language.

M. D. LEARNED.

University of Pennsylvania.

The Lesson of Popular Government. By GAMALIEL BRADFORD.

Vol. I, pp. xix, 520; vol. II, pp. xii, 590. Price, \$4.00. New York: The Macmillan Company.

By popular government the author means a system of government in which the people choose their rulers instead of being ruled by those as to whom they have no choice, and in which participation in this choice of rulers is open to the mass of the people by means of widely diffused rights of suffrage. The lesson of popular government which it is the object of the work to enforce is that the absorption of the authority of government by the legislature tends to anarchy and thence to despotism, and that a strong and efficient executive is the indispensable condition of responsible government.

In support of this thesis the author marshals a vast array of testimony. The experience of the United States and of European countries is passed in review. Nine chapters are devoted to French history alone. Not only national, but state and city government also, is explored for argumentative material. The opinions of many writers on government are examined, and quotations are numerous and copious. The discussion takes a wide range, but is always interesting, and the work is a treasury of information, rather loosely arranged, but evidently the result of years of study and research.

Notwithstanding the great mass of material which the author has gathered in support of his position, his conclusions do not rest firmly upon the evidence. For instance, after reviewing the history of Switzerland, he is compelled to admit that although the legislature is supreme the government works well, but he adds that "this difference is manifestly explained by the nature and conditions of the country, and by the character, habits and traditions of the people." The explanation, while valid, knocks a great hole in the argument by showing that after all it depends upon circumstances whether legislative supremacy is good or bad. As complete a surrender of his case is also made by the author in his comments upon English government. He argues that it works successfully because the legislative supremacy

is modified by the cabinet system, setting up a constitution of executive authority which subjects the legislature to responsible control; but he has to concede the well known fact that the cabinet system does not owe its existence to enactment, but to usage; so here again we are referred to the character, habits and traditions of the people for an explanation of the successful working of their form of government. No ground is left for the author's inference that the advantages of the cabinet system could be secured in this country by seating the heads of executive departments in congress. Because a certain method of government has grown up in one country as a natural development from political conditions, it does not follow at all that the same method would have like results if imposed upon a political situation which has as yet developed no tendencies in that direction. The reasonable inference is quite the other way.

Such considerations discover the fallacy which underlies the entire work and vitiates all its conclusions. The author treats as causative what is really incidental, and he makes this mistake in the first sentence of his first chapter when he speaks of universal suffrage as "a force" which has made its appearance in the world during the present century. The apparatus may be new but the force is not, for it emanates from human nature. Hume laid down the maxim that all government—no matter how despotic or military may seem to be its constitution—is founded on opinion, and this is now generally accepted as a true statement, provided the word opinion is taken in a broad sense so as to comprehend all social cohesions, conscious or instinctive. Opinion, fixed and solidified in definite assignments of social status, developed the hierarchical constitution of government whose ancient pattern has been preserved down to our own times by China, and of which a modern adaptation is exhibited by Russia. The drill and discipline of the human animal in habits of industry and order appear to have been peculiarly the work of this type of government, and the primary strata of civilization were deposited by it. In stability it has immeasurably excelled any other constitution of government, and every civilized state known to antiquity eventually found repose in it. In European history similar tendencies toward the integration of government in some constitution of imperial rule have manifested themselves, but they have been counteracted by insuperable diversities of race character and physical circumstance, producing conditions which subject political structure to a law of metamorphosis whose operation has been attended by great social dissolutions and readjustments, and whose net results we call progress. John Addington Symonds correctly placed the politics of our own times when he said that they are still in the period of mid-renaissance. What is called

the democratic movement is the political phase of the mental awakening of the people, exciting into conscious activity the mass of opinion of which government is the organ and to which its functions must respond. The particular shape which the constitution of government may assume in such circumstances will be determined in any given country by the traditions, habits and character of the people; but as the suffrage in some form or another is a historic agency of western civilization for participation in the conduct of government, it naturally follows that a wide extension of the suffrage will be a common incident of political progress in Europe and America. But the suffrage does not create force, it applies force, and legislation which violates this distinction destroys the value of the suffrage as a social dynamometer and tends to restore primitive conditions of conflict in which the real preponderance of effective force is ascertained by actual trial. Upon this point the United States has had abundant instruction from the results of negro suffrage in the South, but Mr. Bradford fails to avail himself of it. He actually mentions as an evidence of the value of universal suffrage that "the two races have lived side by side, with the exception of a few local riots, in perfect peace," and thus lightly passes by one of the most serious problems of American politics. The crux of that problem involves the lesson of popular government more completely than any other manifestation of the times, and in missing it the author has directed his speculations to the externals rather than to the substance of politics.

HENRY JONES FORD.

Pittsburg, Pa.

Anglo-Saxon Superiority: to What it is Due. By EDMOND DEMOLINS. Pp. xl, 427. Price, \$1.00. Second edition in English, translated from the tenth French edition by Louis Bert Lavigne. London: The Leadenhall Press, and New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

M. Demolins' book has had a striking success from the moment of its publication two years ago. To the American reader even the concession implied in the title is surprising, for the author is a Frenchman writing for the French. Moreover, in the many reviews and discussions called forth by the book (quoted in appendix), there is hardly a hint of protest against the title. It is plain talking when M. Demolins says: "We are familiar in France with that deluded state which consists in being shut up in a beatific and exclusive admiration of ourselves, and singing to ourselves that we are '*la grande nation*,'